arXiv:1612.05226v1 [q-bio.NC] 15 Dec 2016

INTERACTION GRAPH ESTIMATION FOR THE FIRST OLFACTORY RELAY OF AN INSECT.

L. BROCHINI, P. HODARA, C. POUZAT, A. GALVES

Abstract. We consider the model of interacting neurons proposed in [8] and use the statistical selection procedure proposed in [4] to infer the interaction graph from observed neural activity (spike trains) of the first olfactory relay of an insect. We propose a pruning method to deal with small sample sizes. We use simulations to test the efficiency of the estimator and to fix the parameters involved in its construction. We then use these parameters to analyze actual data recorded from the locust (Schistocerca americana) antennal lobe. In order to test the performance of the proposed estimator on our spike train data, the data set is split in two parts and the resulting connection graphs are compared.

1. Introduction

The aim of this work is to explore, test and apply the connectivity graph inference procedure of [4] to the analysis of simulated and real neural activity data. The publicly available real data are spike trains recorded from the first olfactory relay—the antennal lobe—of a locust, *Schistocerca americana*.

The class of models considered in the present work was introduced by Galves and Löcherbah, 2013 [8] as interacting stochastic chains with memory of variable length to model neuronal networks. The authors propose to model the behavior of each neuron in the network as a function of the firing history (spike trains) of all other neurons presynaptic to it.

Until this moment, some other works have unfolded from the original discrete time formulation of the model, including studies of continuous time versions [3], [5], [7], [12], [9], [6] and [13] and a mean field analysis of a particular case of the original model under geometric leakage[2]. While all the aforementioned papers deal with probabilistic aspects of the model, another work by Duarte et al. ([4]) proposed to use statistical model selection in that class of models, introducing an estimator for the influence graph of a neuronal network.

Good electrophisiological multielectrode array recordings can often register the activity of several neurons simultaneously. Raw data is then subject to a spike sorting procedure ([11]) used to discriminate neurons in the recording and ultimately provide a time series of each neurons spike

times. These so called spike trains, can be transformed into a symbolic sequence that represents the process in discrete time: the total duration of the recording is divided into small windows (with the order of milliseconds) and a symbol 1 is attributed to each window that corresponds to the occurence of a spike and, conversely, a symbol 0 is attributed to the absence of a spike in a window. Once this representation of neural behavior is obtained from data, it is possible to perform statistical model selection in the class of models proposed by Galves and Locherbach ([8]) with the influence graph estimation procedure proposed by Duarte et al ([4]).

A key assumption of the stochastic model of neuronal networks is that each neuron loses memory of the process immediately after a spike. The probability of a neuron to spike increases monotonically with its membrane potential. The membrane potential of a neuron i evolves as follows. Whenever i fires, its membrane potential is reset to a resting value. Whenever a presynaptic neuron j fires, the membrane potential of neuron i gains $W_{j\to i}$. At each time step, the neuron is subject to a leakage effect that drives the membrane potential to a resting state. Therefore, at a particular instant, the membrane potential of a given neuron is a function of the spiking history of all neurons presynaptic to it since the last time i spiked.

Assuming the model description above, we adopted the statistical selection procedure of influence graph estimation proposed by [4]. For each neuron i in the sample, we consider all other neurons in the sample as candidate presynaptic neurons. We then estimate the probability of i to spike given the spiking history of all other neurons since i last spiked. For each neuron $j \neq i$, we then use a measure of sensitivity to determine if the conditional spiking probability is affected by changes in j spiking activity. If this sensitivity measure is statistically small, we exclude candidate neuron j from the set of neurons presynaptic to i.

The Paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we describe the model and the estimation procedure. We quote the results obtained in [4] and propose a pruning procedure in order to deal with the situation where the sample size is insufficient. In section 3 we study the properties of the estimation procedure on simulations. In section 4 we apply this procedure for a dataset recorded in the first olfactory relay of a locust. We chose, for the parameters involved in the estimation, the values that fitted the simulations.

2. The model

2.1. **The dynamics.** We start by introducing the notations we use in this article.

- I is a countable set denoting the set of neurons.
- $W_{j\to i} \in \mathbb{R}$ with $i, j \in I$ is a collection of real numbers such that $W_{j\to j} = 0$ for all $j \in I$. $W_{j\to i}$ is the synaptic weight of neuron j on neuron i.
- $\phi_i : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ with $i \in I$ is a collection of non-decreasing measurable functions. We call ϕ_i the spike rate function of neuron i.
- $g_i : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ with $i \in I$ is a collection of positive measurable functions with $g_i(n) > 0$ for all $n > 1, i \in I$. We call g_i the leak function of neuron i.

We consider a stochastic chain $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ taking values in $\{0,1\}^I$, defined on a suitable probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$. For each neuron $i \in I$ at each time $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $X_t(i) = 1$ if neuron i spikes at time t and $X_t(i) = 0$ otherwise.

For each neuron $i \in I$ and each time $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$L_t^i = \sup\{s < t : X_s(i) = 1\}, \tag{2.1}$$

be the last spike time of neuron i strictly before time t. Here, we adopt the convention that $\sup\{\emptyset\} = -\infty$.

For each $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, we call $\mathcal{F}_t$ the sigma algebra generated by the past events up to time t, that is,

$$\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma\left(X_s(j), s \le t, j \in I\right).$$

The stochastic chain $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is defined as follows. For each time $t \in Z$, for any finite set $F \subset I$ and any choice $a(i) \in \{0,1\}, i \in F$,

$$P(X_{t+1}(i) = a(i), i \in F|\mathcal{F}_t) = \prod_{i\in F} P(X_{t+1} = a(i)|\mathcal{F}_t), \tag{2.2}$$

where for each $i \in I$ and $t \in Z$,

$$P(X_{t+1}(i) = 1|\mathcal{F}_t) = \phi_i\left(\sum_{j\in I} W_{j\to i} \sum_{s=L_{t+1}^i}^{t} g_j(t+1-s)X_s(j)\right), \tag{2.3}$$

if $L_{t+1}^i + 1 \le t$, and

$$P(X_{t+1}(i) = 1|\mathcal{F}_t) = \phi_i(0),$$

otherwise.

2.2. **Construction of the estimator.** We describe here the estimation procedure proposed in [4] for the interaction graph.

We write $x = (x_k(i))_{-\infty<k\le 0, i\in I}$ for any configuration $x \in \{0,1\}^{I\times\{\dots,-1,0\}}$ and denote $x_k(F) = (x_k(i), i \in F)$ for any $F \subset I$. Moreover, for any $x \in \{0,1\}^{I\times\{\dots,-1,0\}}$, we write $X_{-\infty}^0 = x$ if $X_k(i) = x_k(i)$ for all $-\infty < k \le 0$ and for all $i \in I$. Finally, for any $\ell \ge 1$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $F \subset I$ and any $w \in \{0,1\}^{\{-\ell,\dots,-1\}\times F}$, we shall write $X_{m-\ell}^{m-1}(F) = w$ if $X_{m+k}(j) = w_k(j)$, for all $-\ell \le k \le -1$ and for all $j \in F$.

Moreover, for any $F \subset I, c \in \mathbb{N}^F$, and any times $t_1 < t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, we write $C_{t_1}^{t_2}(F) = c$ if $C_{t_1}^{t_2}(j) = c(j)$ for all $j \in I$.

Let

$$V_i = \{j \in I \setminus \{i\} : W_{j\to i} \neq 0\} \tag{2.4}$$

be the set of neurons directly influencing neuron i. We suppose that $V_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in I$.

Let $X_1(F_n), ..., X_n(F_n)$ be a sample produced by a version of the stochastic model $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ compatible with (2.2) and (2.3), where $(F_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of finite regions such that $F_m \nearrow I$ as $m \to \infty$.

The procedure is defined as follows. For each positive integer $n \geq 3$, each neuron $i \in F_n$, any local past $w \in \{0,1\}^{\{-\ell,\dots,-1\}\times F_n\setminus\{i\}}$ outside of i with $1 \leq \ell \leq n-2$ and any symbol $a \in \{0,1\}$, we define

$$N_{(i,n)}(w,a) = \sum_{m=\ell+2}^{n} \mathbf{1}\{X_{m-\ell-1}^{m-1}(i) = 10^{\ell}, X_{m-\ell}^{m-1}(F_n \setminus \{i\}) = w, X_m(i) = a\}.$$

The random variable $N_{(i,n)}(w,a)$ counts the number of occurrences of w followed or not by a spike of neuron i ($a = 1$ or $a = 0$, respectively) in the sample $X_1(F_n), \dots, X_n(F_n)$, when the last spike of neuron i has occurred $\ell + 1$ time steps before in the past.

For a fixed local past $w \in \{0,1\}^{\{-\ell,\dots,-1\}\times F_n\setminus\{i\}}$ outside i and given that the last spike time of neuron i has occurred $\ell+1$ time steps before, we define the empirical probability of neuron i having a spike at the next step by

$$\hat{p}_{(i,n)}(1|w) = \frac{N_{(i,n)}(w,1)}{N_{(i,n)}(w)}, \tag{2.5}$$

when $N_{(i,n)}(w) := N_{(i,n)}(w,0) + N_{(i,n)}(w,1) > 0$.

For any fixed parameter $\xi \in (0, 1/2)$, we consider the following set

$$\mathcal{T}_{(i,n)} = \Big\{ w \in \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{n-2} \{0,1\}^{\{-\ell,\dots,-1\}\times F_n\setminus\{i\}} : N_{(i,n)}(w) \geq n^{1/2+\xi} \Big\} \tag{2.6}$$

and define for $w \in \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \{0,1\}^{\{-\ell,\dots,-1\}\times F_n\setminus\{i\}}$ the quantity

$$L(w) = \ell \text{ whenever } w \in \{0,1\}^{\{-\ell,\dots,-1\}\times F_n\setminus\{i\}}.$$

Moreover, for $v, w \in \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \{0,1\}^{\{-\ell,\dots,-1\}\times F_n\setminus\{i\}}$ with $L(v) = L(w)$, we write

$$v_{\{j\}^c} = w_{\{j\}^c} \text{ if and only if } v_{-L(w)}^{-1}\big(F_n \setminus \{j\}\big) = w_{-L(w)}^{-1}\big(F_n \setminus \{j\}\big).$$

Finally, for each $w \in \mathcal{T}_{(i,n)}$ and for any $j \in F_n \setminus \{i\}$ we define the set

$$\mathcal{T}_{(i,n)}^{w,j} = \Big\{ v \in \mathcal{T}_{(i,n)} : L(v) = L(w), v_{\{j\}^c} = w_{\{j\}^c} \Big\}$$

and introduce the *measure of sensitivity*

$$\Delta_{(i,n)}(j) = \max_{w\in\mathcal{T}_{(i,n)}} \max_{v\in\mathcal{T}_{(i,n)}^{w,j}} |\hat{p}_{(i,n)}(1|w) - \hat{p}_{(i,n)}(1|v)|.$$

For any positive threshold parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, the estimated interaction neighborhood of neuron $i \in F_n$, at accuracy ε, given the sample $X_1(F_n), ..., X_n(F_n)$, is defined as

$$\hat{V}_{(i,n)}^{(\varepsilon)} = \big\{ j \in F_n \setminus \{i\} : \Delta_{(i,n)}(j) > \varepsilon \big\}. \tag{2.7}$$

2.3. **Consistency of the selection procedure.** To ensure the existence of the process we impose the following conditions.

Assumption 1. *Suppose that*

$$r = \sup_{i\in I} \sum_{j\in I} |W_{j\to i}| < \infty.$$

Assumption 2. *Suppose that* $g(n) := \sup_{j\in I} g_j(n) < \infty$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Under Assumptions 1–2, the stochastic chain $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is well-defined, see Proposition 5 in Appendix A.2 of [4], whenever the chain starts with a configuration belonging to the set of admissible pasts Ω^{adm} defined as

$$\Omega^{adm} = \left\{ x \in \{0,1\}^{I\times\{\dots,-1,0\}} : \forall\ i \in I,\ \exists\ \ell_i \le 0 \text{ with } x_{\ell_i}(i) = 1 \right\}. \tag{2.8}$$

To ensure the consistency for the estimator we impose also

Assumption 3. *For all* $i \in I$, $\varphi_i \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, [0,1])$ *is a strictly increasing function. Moreover, there exists a* $p_* \in]0,1[$ *such that for all* $i \in I$ *and* $u \in \mathbb{R}$

$$p_* \le \varphi_i(u) \le 1 - p_*.$$

Define for $i \in I$,

$$K_i = \left[\sum_{j\in V_i^-} W_{j\to i} g_j(1), \sum_{j\in V_i^+} W_{j\to i} g_j(1) \right], \tag{2.9}$$

where $V_i^+ = \{j \in V_i : W_{j\to i} > 0\}$ and $V_i^- = \{j \in V_i : W_{j\to i} < 0\}$.

We quote the following proposition from [4].

Proposition 1 (Proposition 1 of [4])**.** *Grant Assumptions 1–3. Let* $X_1(F_n), \dots, X_n(F_n)$ *be a sample produced by a stochastic chain* $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ *compatible with* (2.2) *and* (2.3)*, starting from* $X_{-\infty}^0 = x$ *for some fixed* $x \in \Omega^{adm}$*. Suppose additionally that* V_i *is finite and* $V_i \subset F_n$ *for all* n.
1. **(Overestimation).** *For any* $j \notin V_i$*, we have that for any* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$P\left(j \in \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^{(\epsilon)}\right) \le p_n^o := 4n^{3/2-\xi} \exp\left\{ -\frac{\epsilon^2 n^{2\xi}}{2} \right\}.$$

2. **(Underestimation).** *Let* $m_i = \inf_{u\in K_i} \{\varphi'(u)\} \inf_{j\in V_i} \{|W_{j\to i}| g_j(1)\}$*, where* K_i *is defined in* (2.9)*. Then* $m_i > 0$ *and for any* $j \in V_i$ *and* $0 < \epsilon < m_i$,

$$P\left(j \notin \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^{(\epsilon)}\right) \le p_n^u := 4\exp\left\{ -\frac{(m_i-\epsilon)^2 n^{2\xi}}{2} \right\} + \exp\left\{ -O\left(n^{1/2+\xi}\right) \right\}.$$

2.4. **Pruning procedure.** Since the estimator is well defined only on events of the type $\cap_{i\neq j} D_{i,j}^n$, where $D_{i,j}^n := \left\{ \exists w \in \mathcal{T}_{(i,n)}, \mathcal{T}_{(i,n)}^{w,j} \neq \emptyset \right\}$, we propose a pruning procedure to work in the case where this event is not realized.

The procedure is the following. If there exists $i, j \in F_n, i \neq j$ such that $D_{i,j}^n$ is not realized and $k \in F_n \setminus \{i,j\}$ such that $k \notin \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^{(\epsilon)}$, we estimate V_i considering the set $F_n \setminus \{k\}$ instead of F_n. We repeat this pruning procedure as many times as needed, provided the conditions to do it are fulfilled and denote by $\hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N$ the estimated neighborhood obtained after N pruning steps.

We have the following result.

Proposition 2. *Grant Assumptions 1–3. Let $X_1(F_n), \ldots, X_n(F_n)$ be a sample produced by a stochastic chain $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ compatible with (2.2) and (2.3), starting from $X_{-\infty}^0 = x$ for some fixed $x \in \Omega^{adm}$. Suppose additionally that V_i is finite and $V_i \subset F_n$ for all n.*
1. **(Overestimation).** *For any $j \notin V_i$, we have that for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$P\Big(j \in \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N\Big) \leq \big(1 - (1 - p_n^u)^N\big) + p_n^o.$$

2. **(Underestimation).** *Let $m_i = \inf_{u\in K_i}\{\varphi'(u)\}\inf_{j\in V_i}\{|W_{j\to i}|g_j(1)\}$, where K_i is defined in (2.9). Then $m_i > 0$ and for any $j \in V_i$ and $0 < \epsilon < m_i$,*

$$P\left(j \notin \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N\right) \leq \big(1 - (1 - p_n^u)^N\big) + p_n^u.$$

Proof. We start by proving item 1. We denote by F^N the set of neurons considered at the N-th pruning step and by $G^N := F_n \setminus F^N$ the set of neurons pruned at the N-th pruning step.

Putting $A^N := \left\{\forall k \in G^N, k \notin V_i\right\}$ for the event where all neurons pruned at the N-th pruning step are not in V_i, we have $P(A^N) \geq (1 - p_n^u)^N$.

Now we write

$$P\left(j \in \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N\right) = P\left(\left\{j \in \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N\right\} \cap \overline{A^N}\right) + P\left(\left\{j \in \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N\right\} \cap A^N\right),$$

where $\overline{A^N} := \Omega \setminus A^N$ is the complementary event of A^N.

We have

$$P\left(j \in \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N\right) \leq P\left(\overline{A^N}\right) + P\left(\left\{j \in \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N\right\} \Big/ A^N\right).$$

Since $A^N = \left\{V_i \subset F^N\right\}$, we can apply proposition 1 to obtain $P\left(\left\{j \in \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N\right\} \Big/ A^N\right) \leq p_n^o$.

This gives us

$$P\left(j \in \hat{V}_{(i,n)}^N\right) \leq \big(1 - (1 - p_n^u)^N\big) + p_n^o.$$

The proof of item 2 follows the same steps. □

2.5. **Simulation algorithm.** The following features of the locust antennal lobe were considered [10]:

- There are 830 *projection neurons* (PN) in the antennal lobe, these neurons are excitatory (cholinergic) and fire sodium dependent, propagated, action potentials (that is, classical action potentials).
- There are 300 *local neurons* (LN) in this structure; they are inhibitory (gabaergic) and fire calcium dependent, *local*, action potentials.
- The extracellular recordings used to get the data *do not catch the calcium spikes of the LN; a single cell type is seen: the PN.*

It then makes sense to model / simulate only the PN population using a "trick": *both excitatory and inhibitory* are allowed between PNs. The inhibitory connections are functional ones as opposed to an anatomical one, they are due to one or several interposed LNs [1] that are not simulated. The algorithm is thoroughly presented here.

3. Results on simulations

3.1. **Searching for suitable ϵ and ξ parameter values.** In this section, we use simulated data in order to fix the parameters ξ and ε involved in the estimation procedure. Recall that ξ is the parameter appearing in the definition of the set $\mathcal{T}_{(i,n)}$ in (2.6) and that ε appears in the definition of $\hat{V}^{(\varepsilon)}_{(i,n)}$ in (2.7). The role of ξ is to ensure that the observations contains enough repetitions of a given local past w in order to define the empirical probability $\hat{p}_{(i,n)}(1|w)$. The parameter ε can be seen as a significance threshold for the measure of sensitivity $\Delta_{(i,n)}(j)$.

We simulate a dataset having a similar sample size to our dataset recorded in vivo, i.e. $n = 10^6$ and with the same number of neurons: 5. In figure 1, we give the results of the estimation procedure for different values of the parameters ξ and ε.



Figure 1. Estimation on a simulated dataset

For each couple (ξ, ε) we present the result in a 5×5 matrix. For each line j and column i, the color of the square indicates the presence or absence of influence of neuron j on neuron i and the result of the estimation procedure. The color code is the following. Correct estimations are

represented in grey and white, grey if $W_{j\to i} \neq 0$ and white if $W_{j\to i} = 0$. Incorrect estimations are represented in red and blue, blue if $W_{j\to i} \neq 0$ (false negative) and red if $W_{j\to i} = 0$ (false positive). Due to the construction of the estimated neighborhood, the situation where $\mathcal{T}_{(i,n)} \times \mathcal{T}^{w,j}_{(i,n)} = \emptyset$ makes impossible the estimation procedure, leading to an inconclusive result. These inconclusive results are represented in light red if $W_{j\to i} \neq 0$ and light blue if $W_{j\to i} = 0$.

As expected, low values of the sensitivity threshold ε lead to more false positive whereas high values lead to more false negative.

Note that for high values of ξ we obtain more inconclusive results. This was also expected since the number of observed repetitions needed for the estimation procedure increases with ξ.

The estimation procedure recovers the graph correctly for $\varepsilon = 0,05$ and $\xi = 0,001$ or $0,01$.

3.2. **Pruning.** In order to illustrate the utility of the pruning procedure proposed in section 2.4 we tested it in a subsample of the simulated data which results are shown in the previous section. By using a sample size of $n = 10^5$ and a more strict value of the cutoff parameter $\xi = 0.1$ and $\epsilon = 0.05$ we obtain an estimation shown in Fig 2 A.

The pruning procedure consists in removing connections identified as null and obtaining a new estimation for a smaller subset where the neuron providing a null connection is not considered a presynaptic candidate. Therefore, the pruning procedure can only enhance the graph estimation if there are at least one inconclusive and at least one connection identified as null for each postsynaptic neuron.

In Figure 2 A we can observe conclusive and accurate results for postsynaptic neurons 1,3 and 4, therefore no prunning procedure is applicable. In the case of postsynaptic neuron 2 there are no conclusively null connections, so the prunning procedure cannot be aplied in this case either. On the other hand, neuron 5 exhibits one conclusively null connection $1 \to 5$ and 3 other inconclusive connections, being a candidate to pruning.

Figure 2 B displays the graph estimation after the connection $1 \to 5$ is pruned, produced with the same data and parameters as used in A. In fact, we observe an enhancement in the estimated graph that now exhibits the right connections for neurons presynaptic to 5. This result is reasonable, since the number of presynaptic candidate neurons is reduced and the sample size is the same, improving the quality of the estimation.

4. Results on a dataset recorded in vivo

The dataset is recorded on the antennal lobe of a locust by the mean of extracellular electrodes. The raw data consists of the evolution of the voltage recorded by the electrodes. Since the electrodes are in extracellular medium, the spikes of several different neurons may appear on the same electrode. In order to obtain the spike train, a pre-processing step called spike sorting is required on the raw data. We use the method proposed in [11]. The raw data are available here. A thorough description of the sorting procedure, along with complete code is available here.



FIGURE 2. Original estimator produces too many inconclusives **(A)** for a smaller dataset. When we prune the connection $1 \to 5$ **(B)** we obtain a correct estimation of influence over neuron 5 .

The pre-processing of the dataset analyzed here provides us with spike trains of 5 neurons of about half an hour of spontaneous activity each neuron presenting the order of 10^4 total spikes in the sample.

In order to use the estimation procedure, we need to obtain a spike train in discrete time. We chose the largest possible size of the binning window such that less than one percent of the spike times take place in the same discrete time unit. This leads to a binning window of 10 milliseconds.



FIGURE 3. Estimation for the whole dataset

We fix for ξ and ε the values that fitted the simulations, i.e. $\xi = 0,001$ and $\varepsilon = 0,05$.

We present in figure 3 the result of the estimation procedure. The color code is the following. Grey for a presence of a directed link, white for the absence of a directed link and light red if the result of the estimation is inconclusive.

Unfortunately the results are inconclusives for 2 of the 5 neurons, even with the pruning procedure described in section 2.4.

In order to validate this estimation procedure, we split the dataset in two parts and proceed to the estimation for each part. The results are given in figures 4 A and 4 B.



FIGURE 4. Graph estimation for **A-** the first half of the dataset and **B-** for the second half of the dataset.

We can see that the estimation procedure gives us the same graph for the two different parts of the dataset, except for the influence of neuron 3 on neuron 1 where we have an inconclusive result working with the first half of the dataset.

5. Acknowledgement

This work was produced as part of the activities of Sao Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) Research, Innovation and Dissemination Center for Neuromathematics (grant no. 2013/ 07699-0). L.B. also received Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Cientfico e Tecnolgico (CNPq) support (grant no. 165828/2015-3). P.H. received FAPESP support (grant no. 2016/17655-8).

References

[1] Boeckh, J. and K.-D. Ernst
1987. Contribution of single unit analysis in insects to an understanding of olfactory function. *J Comp Physiol A*, 161:549–565.

[2] Brochini, L., A. Costa, M. Abadi, A. Roque, J. Stolfi, and O. Kinouchi
2016. Phase transitions and self-organized criticality in networks of stochastic spiking neurons. *ArXiv*.
[3] De Masi, A., A. Galves, E. Löcherbach, and E. Presutti
2015. Hydrodynamic limit for interacting neurons. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 158(4):866–902.
[4] Duarte, A., A. Galves, E. Löcherbach, and G. Ost
2016. Estimating the interaction graph of stochastic neural dynamics. *ArXiv*.
[5] Duarte, A. and G. Ost
2016. A model for neural activity in the absence of external stimulus. *Markov Proc. Rel. Fields*, 22(1):37–52.
[6] Duarte, A., G. Ost, and A. A. Rodríguez
2015. Hydrodynamic limit for spatially structured interacting neurons. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 161(5):1163–1202.
[7] Fournier, N. and E. Löcherbach
2016. On a toy model of interacting neurons. *To appear in Annales de l'IHP,*.
[8] Galves, A. and E. Löcherbach
2013. Infinite systems of interacting chains with memory of variable length: A stochastic model for biological neural nets. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 151(5):896–921.
[9] Hodara, P. and E. Löcherbach
2017. Hawkes processes with variable length memory and an infinite number of components. *To appear in Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 49.
[10] Laurent, G.
1996. Dynamical representation of odors by oscillating and evolving neural assemblies. *TINS*, 19:489–496.
[11] Pouzat, C. and G. Detorakis
2014. Spysort: Neuronal spike sorting with python. *Proceedings of the 7th European Conference on Python in Science (EuroSciPy 2014), edited by Pierre de Buyl and Nelle Varoquaux*.
[12] Robert, P. and J. Touboul
2014. On the dynamics of random neuronal networks. *ArXiv*.
[13] Yaginuma, K.
2016. A stochastic system with infinite interacting components to model the time evolution of the membrane potentials of a population of neurons. *To appear in Journal of Statistical Physics*.